

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-48 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, and 25 are amended and Claims 28-48 are added by the present amendment.

Amendments to Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, and 25, and new Claims 28, 35, and 42 find support in the originally filed specification at least at page 15, lines 18-24, page 16, lines 12-15, page 10, lines 20-21, and Figure 6. New Claims 29-34, 36-41, and 43-48 find support in the originally filed specification at least at page 20, line 5, to page 21, line 9, and Figure 7. Accordingly, it is believed no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-12, 14 and 16-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as unpatentable over King et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,737) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,067,541 to Raju et al. (herein "Raju").

Applicant and applicant's representatives gratefully acknowledge the courtesy of a personal interview with Examiner Paula on June 11, 2004. During the interview, differences between the claimed invention and references in the outstanding Office Action were discussed. No formal agreement regarding patentability was reached. Comments discussed during the interview are reiterated below.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a method for production, revision and hierarchical organization of electronic documents on a computer system. The method includes inputting a first item description and a first item category, generating a first item identifier corresponding to the first item description, collecting existing item descriptions from existing item description electronic documents having the first item category that are already stored on the second computer, and generating a first item description electronic document in a plurality of item description electronic documents including the first item description, the first item

category and the first item identifier. In addition, the method includes storing the first item description electronic document in a first digital storage area in a first computer, and generating a first category list electronic document, in the first computer, corresponding to the first item category prior to receiving a request for the first category list electronic document from a web browser.

The first category list electronic document includes at least a portion of the first item description and a reference to the first item description electronic document in the plurality of item description electronic documents, and at least a portion of an existing item description and a reference to each of the existing item description electronic documents having the first item category and that are already stored on the second computer.

Further, the method includes determining if any of a copy of the first item description electronic document and each of the existing item description documents are already stored on the second computer. In addition, the method includes initiating a transfer of a copy of the first category list electronic document and a copy of at least one document determined by the determining not to be already stored on the second computer, and not initiating a transfer of the copy of at least one document determined by the determining to be already stored on the second computer.

Amended independent Claims 14 and 21 include features similar to the features of independent Claim 1 discussed above.

In a non-limiting example, Figures 2, 5A, 5B, 6, and 7 illustrate a method for production, revision and hierarchical organization of electronic documents on a computer system. The computer system includes local computer 180 (e.g., a first computer), ISP server 164 (e.g., a second computer), and an internet client 156 (e.g., a web browser), as shown in Figure 2. Figure 5A shows an example of a screen used to input information for a green apple (e.g., a first item). The input information includes the string "Green apple 'Lollypop'"

260, which is a description of the green apple (e.g., a first item description), and the string “Fruits” 254, which is a category for the green apple (e.g., a first item category). A number, “000456” 252, that identifies the green apple (e.g., a first item identifier) is generated.

Further, as shown in Figure 6, and as discussed in the specification at page 13, line 6, to page 16, line 15, a first item description electronic document including the first item description, the first item category, and the first item identifier, is generated and saved on the first computer. Alternatively, a previous version of an item description electronic document may be modified to create the first item description electronic document, as stated in new Claims 32, 39, and 46.

In addition, Figure 5B shows an exemplary view of information in a generated fruit category document (e.g., a first category list electronic document). This view shows items in the fruit category, including the green apple item, as well as other items corresponding to other item description documents in the plurality of item description documents. In particular, this example shows that the fruit category document (e.g., a first category list electronic document) includes at least a portion of the first item description (i.e., “Green apple ‘Lollypop’”) as well as a description of a “Yellow mango” (e.g., an existing item). Thus, an item description document for the “Yellow mango” is an example of an existing item description document in the plurality of electronic documents. Further, in this example, a copy of the “Yellow mango” description document (e.g., an existing item description document) is already stored on the second computer.

Further, the method in this example determines if copies of any of a particular subset of files already exists on the server. Thus, the method determines if copies of the green apple item description document and the yellow mango item description document are already stored on the second computer, using, for example, a log file as stated in new Claims 29, 36, and 43.

The method also initiates the transfer of the green apple item description document and the fruit category document because these documents are newly created and their copies are not already stored on the second computer. Further, in this example the method does not initiate a transfer of the yellow mango item description document because a copy of this document is already stored on the second computer.

This approach advantageously results in more efficient maintenance of web site files by avoiding the initiation of unnecessary file transfers, thereby reducing file transfer time and minimizing bandwidth requirements between local and ISP servers. Thus, when changes or additions are made to a collection of web pages, only the changed pages are transferred from a local computer to the web server.

As discussed during the interview, the combined teachings of King and Raju do not teach or suggest determining if copies of documents on a first computer are already stored on a second computer, do not teach or suggest initiating a transfer of document copies determined not to be already stored on the second computer, and do not teach or suggest not initiating a transfer of document copies determined to be already stored on the second computer.

As discussed during the interview, King discloses a method of regenerating a complete set of web pages (i.e., a first item description electronic document, an existing item description electronic document, and a first category list electronic document) for each change in layout, structure, or content. Thus, all web files produced in the method of King are regenerated for each web site change and King does not indicate that any distinctions are made about whether a subset of documents are updated or not, and King does not disclose uploading only a subset of documents. Accordingly, King does not disclose any method for making any determination regarding whether or not copies of a subset of documents are already stored on a second computer. Therefore, King does not teach or suggest

“determining if any of a copy of the first item description electronic document and each of the at least one existing item description document are already stored on the second computer,” as in the amended independent claims.

Further, because King does not disclose any method of determining if document copies are stored on a second computer, King also does not disclose any method of initiating a transfer and not initiating a transfer based on that determination, as in the independent claims. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that King also does not teach or suggest “initiating a transfer of the copy of the first category list electronic document and a copy of at least one document determined by the determining not to be already stored on the second computer, and not initiating a transfer of the copy of at least one document determined by the determining to be already stored on the second computer,” as in the independent claims.

Further, as discussed during the interview, Raju also does not teach or suggest determining if copies of documents are already stored on a second computer and initiating and not initiating transfers based on that determination. In FIG. 10, Raju discloses a method of building an index 68 for a web search engine 78 that includes a log file 62 to keep track of which files are changed. When the web search engine is ready to rebuild the index 68, the method reads the changed files and updates the index 68 based on information in the changed files.<sup>1</sup> In other words, Raju discloses rebuilding a search term index file in a search engine to include new words added in files changed since the last time the key word index file was built. Thus, the search engine of Raju maintains an index of search terms, which is different than determining if copies of a file are located on a second computer and initiating a transfer based on that decision, as in the claimed invention. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that Raju also does not teach or suggest “determining if any” copies of documents

---


<sup>1</sup> Raju at column 2, lines 62-64.

are already stored on a second computer and does not teach or suggest "initiating a transfer" or "not initiating a transfer" based on a determination, as in the independent claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 14, and 21, and each of the claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Customer Number  
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)

Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Zachary S. Stern  
Registration No. 54,719

EHK:ZSS:dnf

I:\ATTY\ZS\10250\10250-0001\10250-0001-AMENDMENT 071904.DOC